



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,470	07/02/2003	Daniel Putterman	MACV.P0009	4941
23349	7590	10/01/2007	EXAMINER	
Stattler-Suh PC			ZHAO, DAQUAN	
60 SOUTH MARKET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 480			2621	
SAN JOSE, CA 95113			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/613,470

Applicant(s)

PUTTERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Daquan Zhao

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Status

2. Claims 17 –21 are new.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 6,089,321 B2) and further in view of Hooper et al (US 5,414,455).

Regarding claim 1, Hayashi teach a method for networking a plurality of television devices, said method comprising the steps of:

- receiving a plurality of television signals (e.g. column 6, line 48+, numerous broadcast programs multiplexed in the digital satellite broadcast signal);
- selecting a set of tuners from a plurality of tuners available on a network (e.g. column 6, lines 47-56, Hayashi teaches a home network system, which comprising a server 1, client devices 2 and 3 in figure 1,

wherein the home server 1 has tuner unit 11A and 11B shown in figure 2 and column 8, lines 45-55. 11A and 11B corresponds to "a set of tuners from a plurality of tuners, and tuner unit 11A and 11B are assigned to client devices 2 and 3. The claim does not call for a plurality sets of tuner);

- tuning each of said television signals in one of the tuners selected from the plurality of tuners (e.g. column 8, lines 36-56);
- buffering said television signals on a storage medium in at least one PVR media server (e.g. column 8, lines 4-14, hard disk drive 150, and figure 2, Memory 12A and 12B);
- coupling a plurality of clients, over a network, to said PVR media server (e.g. figure 1, clients 2 and 3 are coupled to server 1);
- assigning at least two of said clients to one or more of said tuners(e.g. column 8, lines 36-55); and
- transferring, over said network, buffered television signals to said clients (e.g. column 7, lines 15-20).

Hayashi fails to specify the plurality of recording devices. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used client device 2 and 3 as recording devices since Hayashi suggests video tape recorder in background of the invention (column 1, lines 37-45) in the home networking system to reduce the user's time of waiting for a broadcast program.

However, Hayashi fails to teach the PVR media server maintaining a write position for the buffering and a plurality of locations within the PVR system. Hooper et al teach the PVR media server maintaining a write position for the buffering (e.g. column 12, lines 20-54) and a plurality of locations within the PVR system (e.g. "locations" of the cache memory block 300 corresponds to the plurality of locations within the PVR system). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hooper et al into the teaching of Hayashi to delivering videos without substantial incremental costs (Hooper et al, column 1, lines 60-67).

Claim 9, 17 and 20 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 10 and 11, Hayashi teaches a single PVR media server comprising a plurality of tuners (e.g. figure 2, tuner 11A and 11B).

Regarding claims 4 and 12, Hayashi teaches buffering said television signals on a storage medium comprises the step of storing at least one television signal on a storage medium in at least one PVR media server for a client so as to record at least one television program for said client (e.g. column 11, lines 17-30).

For claim 21, Hayashi teaches selecting a plurality of tuners located in a media server distributed over the network (e.g. figure 2). Hayashi fails to specify plurality of servers. Hooper et al teach plurality of servers (e.g. figure 8). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate

Art Unit: 2621

the teaching of Hooper et al into the teaching of Hayashi to delivering videos without substantial incremental costs (Hooper et al, column 1, lines 60-67).

4. Claims 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 7,089,321) and Hooper et al (US 5,414,455) as applied to claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20 and 21 above, and further in view of Green et al (US 2004/ 0,218,905 A1).

See the teaching of Hayashi above.

Regarding to claim 6, Hayashi fails to teach resolving any conflicts to assign an available tuner for television signal. Green et al teach resolving any conflicts to assign an available tuner for television signal (e.g. paragraph [0018]-[0019]). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Green et al into the teaching of Hayashi to quickly determine and resolve a program recording conflict (Green et al, paragraph [0004]).

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 6 above.

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Green et al teach resolving any conflicts to assign an available tuner for said television program comprises the steps of: determining whether one of said tuners is available to receive said television signal; if so, assigning said tuner to receive said television signal; if not, determining which tuners are potentially available; querying clients assigned to said tuners potentially available to determine whether said clients desire to cancel recordation of said television program;

Art Unit: 2621

and assigning a tuner potentially available to receive said television signal if no clients cancel recordation of said television program (e.g. paragraph [0018]-[0019]).

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 7 above.

Regarding claim 5, 13 and 18, Green et al teach the step of storing at least one television signal comprises the steps of: assigning a tuner to said client (e.g. paragraph [0023]); allocating space on said storage medium to record said television program (e.g. paragraph [0018]; and storing said television signal on said storage medium during a time scheduled for said television program (e.g. paragraph [0031]).

5. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 7,089,321 B2) and Hooper et al (US 5,414,455) as applied to claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20 and 21 above, and further in view of Srikantan et al (US 6,857,130 B2).

See the teaching of Hayashi above.

Regarding claims 8 and 16, Hayashi fails to teach generating a first position to identify a location within a selected one of said buffered television signals for a first client, and for generating a second position to identify a location within said selected buffered television signal for a second client, said second position being independent from said first position. Srikantan et al teach generating a first position to identify a location within a selected one of said buffered television signals for a first client, and for generating a second position to identify a location within said selected buffered television signal for a second client, said second position being independent from said first position (e.g. column 8, lines 10-19). It would have been obvious for one ordinary

Art Unit: 2621

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Srikantan et al into the teaching of Hayashi to fast reading from the storage medium.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ellis et al (US 2005/0028208 A1); Williams, Jr (US 6,195,797 B1).

Art Unit: 2621

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEG § 706.07 (a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136 (a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing data of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing data of this action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period. Then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing data of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daquan Zhao whose telephone number is (571) 270-1119. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fri. 7:30 -5, alt Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Thai Q, can be reached on (571)272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Daquan Zhao


THAI Q. TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
EBC CENTER 2600
Tran Thai Q
Supervisory Patent Examiner